Description	County Planni	ng Board January 26, 2010	
Date	01/26/2010	Location	County Planning Board
Time	Speaker	Note	
6:01:27 PM	President Kerry White	Call to Order. Members Present: Kerry White, Marianne Amsden, C.B. Dormire, Don Seifert, Mike McKenna, Do Espelien, Julien Morice, Susan Riggs, Byron Anderson, Davis. Staff Present: County Planners Sean O'Callaghan Rogers and Warren Vaughan, County Administrator/Inter Planning Director Earl Mathers, County Attorney Marty and Recording Secretary Glenda Howze.	oug and Pat , Tom erim
<u>6:01:32 PM</u>	President Kerry White	Public Comment. There was no public comment on matt the agenda.	ers not on
<u>6:01:46 PM</u>	President Kerry White	Approval of December 8, 2009.	
6:02:08 PM		The minutes stand approved as presented.	
6:02:10 PM		Planning Department Update.	
6:02:22 PM	Sean O'Callaghan, County Planner	Circulated an update on the budget, details of expenditure December 31, 2009. Update on Parks and Trails Town Hometing, there were over 60 people who attended to shar views, discuss potential solutions to identified problems discuss who might be responsible for those solutions. The step is for the Parks and Trails Committee to hold meeting community in the County to get more specific direction of localized direction on planning priorities. This is publiced being done pursuant to a grant from Blueprint America where the being done in conjunction with Montana PBS. A full republic comments collected to date is available on the well-marked meeting done in need of someone to attend the TCC meeting to the support of the property o	fall re their and e next ngs in each on more outreach which is ort of the b. ng for her
<u>6:05:45 PM</u>	Pat Davis	Inquired about the Growth Policy re-write status.	
6:05:45 PM	Sean O'Callaghan	It is still in the County Attorney's Office. They haven't counter review yet. I spoke with Jecyn yesterday and she say review would be very narrow in scope just looking to may that whatever changes were suggested and the end docur would be compliant with state statute. They have a lot go over there but I hope they will get to it in the next month	id that her ake sure nent oing on
6:06:33 PM	President	We had the open house forum the other night and we did	send out

	Kerry White	a survey to the Homeowner's Association and had an excellent response from [them], about 50% [of the respondents] were interested in doing some type of parks and trails improvements within their subdivision. That was encouraging to see that outcome.
6:07:06 PM	President Kerry White	Planning Board Bylaws: discussion and decision on C.B. Dormire's letter requesting deletion of Bylaw #14
6:07:17 PM	C.B. Dormire	I move that we delete item number 14 from the bylaws, not renumber any of the others but just note that number is reserved.
6:08:25 PM	Mike McKenna	Second.
6:08:33 PM		Public comment.
6:08:53 PM	Earl Mathers, County Administrator	Noted that he has had conversations with a couple commissioners about this issue. They are generally not supportive of summarily changing the bylaws of the board. They also believe that it is their prerogative to have say over the bylaws. It should also be made clear that this has nothing to do with the performance of the current president, which has been exemplary, but rather a desire on the part of the County Commission to assert a modicum of control over all of the boards, which truly need to be working in close collaboration with the Commission and departments.
6:10:57 PM	Marty Lambert, County Attorney	Thank you for recognizing the interest that the public and staff would have on this issue and inviting public comment on it. I was asked to give a formal opinion on this topic. This drew the attention of not only the board members but many others. I disagree with the conclusions drawn in the letter drafted by Mr. Dormire. I haven't given a formal opinion yet but will tell you exactly what that opinion will say. Summarized opinion based on 76-1-305(1) and the Commission's interest that it has in its volunteer boards. Referred to 7-1-201(1)(c), regarding creation of boards by the Commission and their authority with these boards. The Commissioners have plenary control over your operation. They value your input and appreciate the time that you give to this volunteer board. Referred to other boards that have gone off on their own and the problems that has caused for the County and its residents. Explained that he recognizes the Planning Board is not in the same category with these others but wants to make sure they understand the authority of the Commission with administrative boards and their desire to be more involved with these boards because of these problems than they were a year ago. The Planning Board does have the ability to prescribe the term of officers it its bylaws but the Commission can also review those bylaws and if they feel it necessary for the good of the operation of the Planning

		and Zoning affairs of the County that it needs to be changed, they have the right to do that.
6:17:24 PM		Public comment closed.
6:17:29 PM		Board discussion and questions including when officers are elected, clarification on what is being voted on, whether there is a difference between those boards that are provided for under statute versus those that aren't, and term limits on other boards
6:19:36 PM	Marty Lambert, County Attorney	Explained that the other boards are provided for by statute - such as Weed Board, Fair Board, Television Boards, etc. All have statutory authorization, some to a greater degree than others. The Planning Board does have a lot of statutory authority.
6:20:36 PM	Mike McKenna	Inquired about term limits on other Boards and for elected officials. Noted that he did consult with an attorney on this issue. (read response) The response, in summary, states that the law does not provide for the Commission to review the bylaws and bylaws are not required at all. It is a good thing to be able to not elect someone who hasn't done a good job or re-elect someone that has done a good job. We aren't zombies, we believe that we are free thinking, free will people who can make good proper decisions that is why I wonder if this particular attorney's reading of the law says that we can amend our bylaws without review by the Commission. There aren't term limits for others so I don't know why we are making a big deal out of this now.
6:23:06 PM	Marty Lambert, County Attorney	7-1-201(7) states that terms of all members may not exceed four years, so there are term limits. The Commission will take a look at whatever you do and make a determination about the appropriateness of that.
6:23:47 PM	Mike McKenna	We hope that we are making a decision tonight not for a particular person or for any particular short term view but a decision that will stand the test of time. People who volunteer for this kind of board are capable of making hard decisions that they need to and have an open and frank discussion about those decisions.
6:24:21 PM	Susan Riggs	It seems like there is nothing in state law that requires officer term limits but there is nothing that precludes us from having them either. It seemed that C.B. was indicating that he does believe there is something that makes that illegal - requested clarification on that aspect of the letter.
6:24:54 PM	C.B. Dormire	I'm not sure that the question of whether or not the bylaw is valid isn't the important one but whether it makes sense to have such a limitation. Reading the statute, struck me that we didn't have the ability to bind subsequent boards, for people in the past to have imposed on this group at this meeting such a limitation struck me

6:31:17 PM 6:32:25 PM	Pat Davis Marianne Jackson Amsden	not the first time that the Commission has sent out emanations of some disquietude through Earl. Replied to Mike's inquiry about term limits on other Boards and noted that the Open Lands Board does not have term limits. Also noted that she is upset by the threat of being removed, based on what the County Attorney presented. They do have the power to do that but don't like that they are trying to intimidate and control us as such. I wanted to respond to Mike's comment that in his view this wouldn't be done to benefit any particular people or situation but to stand the test of time, in that case the best way to do that would be to send it to the bylaw committee. I'd like us to have some discussion about that why the last bylaw change took 13 months and this one doesn't even go through the committee. I'd like to hear why that's not the discussion first. Read into the record her email on why she disagrees with changing the bylaws. 1) Important to image of Board for consistency and to avoid appearance of impropriety. 2) Why wasn't this brought up before now so that it isn't being decided on with short notice, which has been a
		as being beyond what I read into the statutory language. A member of the bar and County Attorney has certain powers, puts him into the position of the Attorney General of the State of Arizona, opinion given great weight unless erroneous. There is no reason for us to assume that he is wrong. The point is one whether it makes sense and the other [point] does the Commission have the ability or should we grant them the prerogative to decide what member we can elect president. That is the harder question and I'm very disappointed that we don't have any Commissioners here. After I got Sean's electric communication I sent a copy of my memo to the Commission to see if they had any views and I got no response. I'm very surprised that Earl was given the assignment to come in and say what he did. A couple of good things that have come from this are Earl's email that was one of the last things that I got was a model of communication - short, concise, and the use of the word 'insert' was particularly tactful - I see why he has managed to survive as well as he has working for 3 different bosses at one time. Someone sent me Marianne's letter, so we all learned that she is home-schooling her children - one of the finer things that anyone can do on this planet. My opinion of her went up another notch in my book. I think we ought not to focus on legality of whether or not the bylaw provision is valid, but whether the policy makes any sense and then we have to figure out what the Commission's message is. I wonder if this method of communication that we've lapsed into in the last few months - its

		are appointed. We are advisory and not meant to rise to a position of power in the community. 4) We don't want to give appearance to the public that certain people or ideologies are monopolizing the board. This appearance could lessen our credibility and serve to lessen interest in the board as well. 5) We have worked hard to become friends despite our differences and I don't want to be in the position of having to vote off a friend, one that has done a fine job. 6) There are other capable, willing people that can do the job.
6:35:28 PM	President Kerry White	To answer the first question, as President I've always tried to accommodate members of the board, public, County Attorney's Office, planners, commissioners, etc., anything that someone wanted discussed, put on an agenda. This was a deletion of a bylaw which was a request from a board member to put on the agenda. Because it was not a change in the wording or an addition of an additional bylaw that needed discussion of the wording, I thought it would be appropriate because it was a deletion and a request from Board member to put it on because it is ultimately the decision of the whole Board.
6:36:38 PM	Byron Anderson	I'm going to support this motion. I've read the bylaws over and it sums it up line 17 which says the Board may amend these bylaws. It doesn't say that the Board may ask the County Commission if it is okay to amend these bylaws. I'm okay with moving forward, amending and electing a President whether that is Kerry or someone else tonight. If at that point the County Commission wants to exercise something that exists outside of our bylaws that is their choice. At this point I'm going to support this motion.
6:37:43 PM	Don Seifert	I never even got to the point where I started thinking about the bylaw change. I got hung up on the timing. It boiled down to integrity and credibility. We are a volunteer board that does have some advisory capacity to the County Commission but I feel that our constituents are the citizens of the Gallatin County and it is important that they trust what we do and that they know when they come forward to us that we are another set of eyes that are looking out for their concerns, and that their concerns are met with open minds and open hearts I don't know how I feel about amending the bylaws because I couldn't get past the timing. If we vote to change the bylaws five minutes before an election of officers to me that undermines our integrity and our credibility. I have a real problem with that. If we move this off to a subcommittee and work out some kind of resolution with the County Commissioners on how to make that happen, that would be fine with me but I have a big problem with changing the bylaws right before we vote on new officers. We are undermining our integrity and credibility if we vote to change the bylaws right before we have an election.

6:40:07 PM	President Kerry White	This request came from C.B. on the 15th of December. The meeting had already been canceled around Christmas in December and then because of the lack of agenda items for the second Tuesday of January the meeting was canceled. I could have called a special meeting but I didn't feel it would be appropriate to call everyone in just to discuss the bylaws. I understand your concerns.
6:40:58 PM	C.B. Dormire	It seems to me that where we are is deciding what to do vis a vis the Commission. If two Commissioners thought it important enough to proceed in this fashion, it must have something to do other than a formality of the process for amending the bylaws. I don't read it that they are commenting on the process because if they didn't have a concern about the particular amendment suggested they would just approve it if that is the procedure they've established to follow. I suggest it has to do with the particular election result that might come out. I think I heard Marty say that it is within the Commissioner prerogative to approve or disapprove any changes to the bylaws of this board. [Mr. Lambert indicated that this is correct.] We have a circumstance in that two of the Commissioners told Earl that if we approve this they will consider not approving this. That is an odd thing. On the other hand if they disapprove then we are somewhere I don't know where. If we have an election result that would contravene the amendment we just made I suppose then we have another election. The real question is how to deal with an indication of an emanation from the Commission that Earl has been directed to convey to us which is wholly unsatisfactory to me.
6:45:06 PM	Mike McKenna	I have another attorney opinion that I read that said that the law does not reserve the right of the County Commission to review and approve the bylaws of the board.
6:45:41 PM	C.B. Dormire	I've never been of the view that there is anything to gain by fighting with the Commissioners. If they had come into the meeting and said we don't want you to do it, if you do it we'll disapprove it so please don't, or if one of them had picked up the phone and called any of us and said that, I'd have said okay, fine. We don't know that for sure, we don't know quite what is going on. I'm troubled by any suggestion that anything we're considering here cast aspersions on anyone's integrity or credibility, I reject. I don't think we ought to be saying such things. Having said that I don't know what to do, it is just a mess.
6:47:01 PM	Don Seifert	Perceptions of lack of integrity or perceptions of lack of credibility. I view that the Commission asking Earl to come down and visit with us this evening as a pretty direct chain of command from the Commission. I've also had an opportunity in the past couple weeks when dealing with gravel pits to have comments

		from two of the Commissioners that have stated just what Earl has stated.
6:48:05 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	I think a sensible solution would be since timing is not an issue, why don't we vote down the current motion and have a new motion to send it to the bylaw committee and have them meet with the Commission for discussion.
6:48:37 PM	Byron Anderson	We have a motion on the table, we have a seconded motion on the table. This motion is going to be voted on. You can vote it up or down but it is going to be voted on. I would not ask someone to remove the motion from the table. It is going to be voted on.
6:49:00 PM		Vote: 4:1:4; Members Riggs, Morice, Seifert and Amsden opposed; Member Dormire abstained; Members Anderson, Davis, Espelien, McKenna and White vote in favor. Motion failed.
6:50:11 PM	President Kerry White	I will say that there are many boards in the County that have had a chairman or president for many years. It doesn't matter to me. I was requested by a few of the board members to continue as president, maybe because of what I've tried to accomplish, how I've conducted meetings and stuff. I told them at that time that I'd be willing to do that but that I was restricted by the bylaw so that if I was going to serve again you'd have to change the bylaw. It was not my intention to bring forward some crazy bylaw change prior to the meeting. I know there are some issues with some planning department folks that tend to exert themselves or thrust themselves into the matters of the board, which is their prerogative - we are all human and it is their decision. I've always respected everyone and their thoughts on the board. I've enjoyed being a part of this board. It does take a lot of time. Noted the Planning Board attendance sheet and the errors that were made in the addition of absences and Susan's attendance was not correct. Reviewed attendance of each member. I've been on this board for nine years and I have really enjoyed it. It is quite a dedication in time. Noted the various committee meetings that he has participated in. The future President is an ex parte member of all of the committees and any committees that you are assigned to at this point you must step down and you lose your voting right on the committee but you don't lose the ability to comment at any of the meetings. I want to thank everybody for the opportunity to serve.
6:55:23 PM	President Kerry White	Election of Officers:
<u>6:55:34 PM</u>		a. President
6:55:57 PM	Marianne Jackson	Nominated Don Seifert for President.

	Amsden	
6:56:10 PM	Mike McKenna	Nominated C.B. Dormire for President.
6:56:24 PM	Doug Espelien	Motion to close nominations.
6:56:29 PM	Byron Anderson	Second.
6:58:12 PM		Vote: Seven votes for C.B. Dormire; three votes for Don Seifert.
6:58:29 PM	Doug Espelien	Nominated Kerry White for Vice President.
6:58:42 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Nominated Don Seifert for Vice President.
6:58:56 PM	Mike McKenna	Motion to close nominations.
6:59:01 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Second.
7:00:35 PM		Vote: Seven votes for Kerry White; three votes for Don Seifert.
7:01:18 PM		Discussion regarding the position of Secretary. The Planning Director appoints the Secretary. In the past the Board asked the preceding Secretary if she's willing to continue. Ms. Howze indicated that she is willing to serve.
7:02:38 PM	President C.B. Dormire	Regular Agenda. Presentation and preliminary discussion on Proposed Gravel Mining District Boundary and Regulation.
7:02:50 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planner	Presentation and distribution of updated map.
7:14:22 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Inquired about anticipated changes from what the Task Force recommended and if there are many, asked that they be called out to the attention of the Board.
7:14:33 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planner	We will call them out in the next memo and try to articulate best we can those changes. Based on the feedback that we've gotten from the County Attorney's Office, what you will see as a result of this process, the substantive content is in tact. The format will be changed, but the adoption and all the standardized language is still part of that. The content is the same, the intention and the purposes will be contained in that but the format will be modified for legal purposes.

7:15:45 PM		Discussion between board members, County Attorney and staff regarding the one-mile planning area around Three Forks and other municipalities and who is responsible for reviewing planning matters in these areas.
7:26:53 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Inquired about what is allowed in the donut around Bozeman as far as gravel pits.
7:27:07 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planner	There are a number of zoning classifications. AS which encompasses a vast majority of the area allows mining operations with a conditional use permit. It does not follow the Task Force's recommended process, it is the Commission's intention to request staff with a zone text amendment the AS districts to reflect the recommendations that will ultimately get flushed out.
7:27:41 PM		Discussion regarding what areas the map/district includes and what it does not include.
7:32:12 PM	Doug Espelien	In the case of Area 4, will this supersede the Gallatin Gateway Community zoning regulations that they have in place?
7:32:30 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planning	Technically there is only a plan in place [in Gallatin Gateway]. There is a zoning commission that has been appointed by the [County] Commission to develop the comprehensive zoning document for just the Four Corners Zoning District. This single use district that will include the Gallatin County area is a stop-gap, it does not supersede it. The Gateway Community is developing their own regulation that will come sometime fairly soon before this board and will be adopted by the Commission through a zone text and a zone map amendment.
7:33:27 PM	Don Seifert	Explanation regarding which planning entity (Belgrade City-County Planning Board, Gallatin County Planning Board, etc.) is responsible for what area and what representation is on these various boards. Also explained the various areas and how the overlay will work for each one.
7:37:20 PM		Questions and discussion regarding Area 3 and Area 4, the ability to opt in or out of the district and the noticing of the people in and around these areas. Comments on whether or not a disadvantage exists for those who are in or out of existing districts versus the pending gravel pit district overlay.
7:40:29 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Inquired about the reasons the Commission had for not expanding the boundaries when you presented that to them.
7:40:40 PM		One of their criteria was areas for potential conflict. They were looking at this map with the density on it. They saw very few

		houses below that line and the potential for not a lot of conflict there. My concern is that directly north of the Norris Road there are a fair number of dwellings there and that could be a potential conflict, just a matter of 120 feet across the road.
7:41:29 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planner	Noted that the proposed boundary would essentially be an expansion of Area 4. It would not be amending or adding to the planning area for the Amsterdam/Churchill district. It will be a panhandle coming off to the west from Area 4. In addition, staff is asking for some Board comment and direction on how to proceed with this particular process. Two areas of interest: 1) Scheduling - we will work with you to get these things on future agendas so if there are dates that will work better for the Board we need to know that; 2) Once the regulation is in a draft form for your review, I will distribute that to the Board as soon as possible or at the next Board meeting - whichever the Board desires.
7:42:56 PM		Area 3 and Area 4 will be the topics for discussion. Explanation to the Board and in particular new members of how the gravel pit regulations came to be a topic of interest, history on the matter and pressing timeframe's for the future.
7:48:06 PM		Discussion regarding enforcement of the gravel pit regulations once they are in place.
7:53:05 PM		Discussion regarding single-issue zoning and the problems with a lapse between the interim regulation and the permanent regulations.
7:55:03 PM	Mike McKenna	Noted that the discussions with Mr. Lambert today are the very reason why the Board would like to have some sort of legal representation at the Board meetings.
7:55:59 PM	County Attorney Marty Lambert	At a meeting between you and the Commission in this room, we talked about that and I expressed that you only have to call me about a particular matter and will attend. I never hear from you folks. With regard to this particular issue, I'm happy to be here for these discussions.
7:56:46 PM	Byron Anderson	[Regarding funds to pay for enforcement staff:] The Planning Board has the money in the budget to fund something like that, it is just a matter of the way the monies are transferred in and our of the budget. This is something that needs to be discussed before putting together a new budget for next year.
7:57:31 PM	Susan Riggs	Noted that she and Julien met with Planning staff as part of the neighborhood planning subcommittee meeting to talk about these boundaries. Overall we feel that the gravel regulations are far beyond the neighborhood subcommittee. We mostly met to talk about the actual boundaries and how they correspond to the

		neighborhood planning areas. We wanted to make sure with the board that the review of the gravel regulations is not something that is solely on the neighborhood planning subcommittees list for providing a report. If it is we can certainly do that but we wanted to make sure that it wasn't going to a certain subcommittee but that it is going to be a board-wide issue for us to talk about. I do agree that is helpful to have legal staff assist us, but in the case of the CUP expiring, I think that any of the planners in the audience could have explained that to us - they did so at the subcommittee meeting.
7:58:48 PM	Mike McKenna	I'm wondering what the big rush is, and I was able to get a comment from an attorney and I appreciate that.
7:59:00 PM	Kerry White	Every time we come up with 201 and 101 zoning, I think 76-1-113 is still in place. [Read noted statute.] This is the camel's nose under the tent to regulate, further regulate, or cause some regulation that will put some person that only has gravel on his property. This is not a prohibition to get the gravel out but could cause enough monetary hardship to completely stop the recovery of any mineral. I think it has been protected in this state: forestry, agriculture and minerals and I really see no difference in a mining operation next door to a residence and a milking/dairy operation with 50 or 100 cows that would be agriculture, the spraying of weeds that may be noxious to an owner that lives next to an agricultural operation. They've always been protected in this state. I believe this is spot zoning. In response to what Mr. Seifert said, putting the boundary on the road might give undue advantage to the property owner on the other side of the road - what that tells me is that the guy that is outside of this district being regulated for gravel pits has an unfair advantage over the guy that is right next to him that is not regulated or vice versa. With that, I can't support the regulation on this mining, it is something that has always been protected in this state. For those that want additional regulation to control people's lives, it takes more people to administer it, it takes more people to enforce it, it takes more tax dollars, more effort, more time through government. It is bigger government, it grows government. I'm disappointed in how this regulation came about and I'm disappointed in how this regulation came about and I'm disappointed in how this regulation came about and I'm disappointed in how this regulation came about and I'm disappointed in how the sequence for zoning for single use. I don't know how the zoning changes - you can go in for a zone map change, zone regulation change, or three property owners with 40 acres to change [create] the zoning. My question to staff would be, say in Area 3 you

8:03:09 PM	President C.B. Dormire	Commission. What is the process to add additional regulation in the area once you have the single use zone in there or to designate a certain area within Area 3 as additional regulation within the area. Is that a rhetorical question?
9.02.12 DM		Tt :th:
8:03:12 PM	Kerry White	It is something like that, I don't know what it is.
8:03:17 PM	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	I would be glad to answer it immediately.
8:03:17 PM	President C.B. Dormire	It is a rhetorical question.
8:03:23 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Suggested that with regards to legal representation at the Board meetings, perhaps the meetings could be organized such that one meeting a month had those agenda items on it that might need legal input to make it more efficient for the County Attorney's Office. Addressed Tom's request for input/direction regarding the upcoming gravel pit items, noting that the whole board does need to provide input and the proposal to forward whatever you have as soon as you have it would be good so that it can be reviewed and discussed at the next meeting.
8:04:52 PM		Public comment. There was no public comment on this matter.
8:05:08 PM	Don Seifert	With respect to Kerry, and I respect your feelings on that. It is important to know that in 76-2-209 says that (2) "The complete use, development, or recovery of a mineral by an operation that mines sand and gravel or an operation that mixes concrete or batches asphalt may be reasonably conditioned or prohibited on a site that is located within a geographic area zoned as residential" They can be reasonably conditioned or denied there however if it isn't zoned residential -everything else you cannot prohibit. The other thing, regarding the nose under the tent flap, the Task Force worked really hard on that and it is important to know that the Commission at any time can do a 201 district. However, with this in place, in order to modify this, it requires five things - a resolution, a map, regulation, notification and protest. To amend the district requires the same thing, all five things. The Commission in the middle of the night cannot change it. It is not the camel's nose under the tent flap. As to the cost, certainly there is a cost to it. But, the cost to not protect the County's infrastructure, to not protect the health and welfare of the citizens of the County, to not protect their safety, far outweighs the cost of

		the program.
8:07:52 PM	President C.B. Dormire	We have differing views but let's not try to resolve them tonight.
8:08:07 PM	Susan Riggs	To amend a zoning district is the same process as to create one.
8:08:18 PM	Julien Morice	I can understand Kerry's concern but Area 3 was pretty much unanimous of the landowners around it. There really were no objections to it. That is why I abstained from that vote, I didn't have too many objections to it because there weren't objections. My issue would be that in Area 4 if the panhandle came out. The road argument for me doesn't hold any water for me. You can say that about just about any line on here - that the guy outside the boundary has an advantage over the guy on the inside of the boundary. Area 3 they wanted to be a part of it, they were, the guy on the other side didn't want to be - he wasn't. Area 4 if the County wants to expand on that and the landowners want it, I'd be fine with it. I may personally disagree with what they want to do with their land. I may personally think that they are limited the future potential and value of their property, but if they want to do it then they can do it, but they have to want to do it and be part of the process.
8:09:46 PM	President C.B. Dormire	Let's move on from discussing the substance of this and talk about procedure. On the procedure, at the next meeting, what is contemplated that we will need to do?
8:10:08 PM	Tom Rogers, County Planner	The County Commissioners have asked for a recommendation from you, from the Board, by March 23rd. You have four regularly scheduled meetings before that. It sounds like the Board would like to have the draft regulations sooner rather than later so the moment that is available the department will forward it to your attention. We will forward memos during each regularly scheduled meeting on concepts and to remind you that we will have a discussion of that if the Board chooses. How it works beyond that is entirely up to the Board. The Commission has asked for a recommendation by March 23rd, so that is the deadline to keep in mind. All of the documentation should be to the Board by Friday, February 5th.
8:11:37 PM		Discussion regarding what the Board will be discussing at the next meeting. There will be two separate zoning documents - one for Amsterdam/Churchill and one for the southern valley, which will be virtually identical. They will have a different description and some other naming additions but you'll be able to follow what those are. In addition to that, that regulation refers to the applications submittal requirements and that documentation will be included. Everything that will be in a packet that is supplied to an

		applicant will be supplied to the Board.
8:13:37 PM	President C.B. Dormire	At the next meeting we will discuss legal representation of the Planning Board [Marty will attend that meeting.], discuss which committees each board member wants to serve on and the topics that each committee should be discussing.
8:14:46 PM	Pat Davis	Noted that she will be out of the country and not in attendance at the next meeting.
8:15:53 PM	President C.B. Dormire	Other Business.
8:15:56 PM	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Noted the success of the Town Hall meeting as referenced in the Planning Department Update. Also inquired to County Attorney Lambert whether or not emails sent to and from Board members need to be disclosed on the record regarding any topic of discussion at Board meetings.
8:17:18 PM	County Attorney Marty Lambert	Explained that they do not at this time. The Board serves as a legislative body and not a judicial body, so those communications are not considered ex parte discussions.
8:20:03 PM		Meeting adjourned.

Produced by FTR Gold™ www.fortherecord.com